

A brief declaracion
of the Lordes Supper, written by
the syngular learned man, and most
constaunt Martir of Jesus Christ,
Nicholas Ridley Bishop of Londe
don prisoner in Oxforde, a litel
before he suffred deathe for
the true testimonie of
Christ.

Roma.8.

For thy sake are we killed all daye
long, and are compted as shepe
appointed to be slayne.

Neuertheles in all
these thinges we o-
uercome through
him, that lo-
ned vs.

Anno. 1555.

To the Reader.

Vnderstante (good reader) that
this great clarke and blessed martir, bishop
Nicholas Ridley sought not (by setting
futthe this notable godly piece of leaunced worke)
the bayne glorie of the world, nor temporal frend-
ship of men for his present aduauncement, muche
lesse he hunted hereby for Bishoprikes and bene-
fices, as all his aduersaries (the enemies of Chri-
stes truthe and ordinaunce) the Papistes comonly
doo: but hauing consideracion of the great charge
of soule committed vnto him, and of thacompte
therof whiche the iustice of God woldre require at
his handes , intending therwithall to be fownde
blameles in the great daye of the Loide, seing he
was put aparte to defende the Gospel. he not on-
ly forsooke landes, goodes, world, frendes, and him
selfe withall; and testified the truthe specified in
this boke by his learned mouthe in the open pre-
sence of the worlde : but also (to leaue a sure mo-
nument and lone token vnto his flocke) he hathe
egestred it by his owne penne in this forme en-
suyng, and sealed it vp with his blood . forasmuch
than as he hath approued him selfe no bayne dis-
putour , no wethercocke, nor hypocrite , seyng he
hathe willingly genen his lyfe for the truthe:
and inasmuche also as his loue and
most constaunt christian conscience
speaketh freely vnto thee , gentill
reader : I beseeche thee for
Christes sake and thyne
owne, lende him thine
indifferet heart ,
and pacient
heatyng.



Many thynges confounde
a weake memorie: a fewe
places well weighed and
perceaued, lyghten the vn-
derstanding. Truthe is ther to be sear-
ched, wher it is certayne to be hade.
Though God dothe speake the truthe
by man, yet in mannes worde (which
God hath not reuealed to be his) a man
may doubt, without mystrust in god.
Christ is the truthe of God reuealed
vnto man from heauen by God hym
selfe, and therfore in his worde the
truthe is to be founde, which is to be
embraced of al that be his. Christ bid-
deth vs aske, & we shall haue: searche,
and we shall fynde: knocke, and it shal
be opened vnto vs. Therfore our hea-
uenly fater, the autor and fountayne
of all truthe, the botomles sea of al vn-
derstanding, sende downe (we beseeche
the) thy holy spirite in to our heartes,
and lyghten our vnderstanding wylth
the beames of thy heauenly grace.

We aske thee this (O merciful fater)
not in respecte of our desartes, but for
thy deare sonne oure sauour Iesus
Christes sake. Thou knowest (O hea-
uenly fater) that the controuersie a-

*The. bles-
sed mar-
g:ts prayer*

A z bout

Note.

bout the Sacrament of the blessed bo-
dye and blood of thy deare sonne, our
saueour Iesu Christ, hathe troubled
not of late only þ churche of Englade,
Fraunce, Germanye, and Icalie, but
also many yeares agoo. The fault is
ours (no doubt) therfore, for we haue
deserued thy plague. But (O Lorde)
be mercifull, and releue our myserie
with som light of grace. Thow kno-
west (o Lorde) how this wicked wold
rolleth vp and downe, and releth to &
fro: and careth not what thy will is,
so it maye abyde in wealth. If truthe
haue wealth, who are so stowte to de-
fende the truthe, as they: But if Chri-
stes croise be layed on truthe backe,
than they vanyshe awaie straight, as
ware before þ fire. But these are not
they (O heauenly father) for whom I
make my most moane, but for those
sely ones (O Lord) which haue a zeale
vnto thee: those I meane, which wold
and wishe to knowe thy will, and yet
are letted, holden backe, & blynded by
the subtleties of Satan and his Mis-
nisters, the wickednesse of this wret-
ched worde, and the synful lustes and
affectiones of the fleshe. Alas Lorde,
thow knowest that we be of our sel-
uies

nes but fleshe, wherin ther dwelleth
nothing that is good. How than is it
possible for man without the (O Lorde)
to understande thy truthe in dede?
Can the natural man perceave the
will of God? O Lorde, to whom thow
gauest a zeale of thee, geue them also
(we beseeche thee) þ knowledge of thy
blessed will. Suffre not the (O Lorde)
blyndlye to be ledde, for tostryue a-
gainst thee as thow diddest those (A-
las) which crucified thine owne sone:
forgue them (O Lorde) for thy deare
sonnes sake, for they knowe not
what they doo. They do thinke (Alas,
O Lorde) for lacke of knowlage, that
they doo vnto the good seruice, even
whan agaynst thee they doo most ex-
tremely rage. Remembre, O Lorde
(we beseeche the) for whom thy mar-
tyr Stephan did praye, and whom
thyne holy Aopstle Paule did so truly
and earnestly loue: that for their sal-
uacion, he wished hym self accursed
for them. Remembre (O heauenly fa-
ther) the prayer of thy deare sonne,
our sauour Christe, vpon the crosse,
whan he sayd vnto thee: O father for-
gue them; they knowe not what they
do. With this forgiuenesse, O good

A 3 Lorde,

Lorde, geue me (I beseche the) thy gra-
ce, so here briesly to set furthe the say-
enges of thy scinne our sauour Iesu
Christ, of his Euāgelistes, and of his
apostles, that in this aforesaide con-
uersie, the light of the truthe, by þ lan-
terne of thy worde maye shyne vnto
al them that loue the.

Of the Lordes last supper do speake
expresly the euāgelistes, Matthewe,
Marke, & Luke: but non more playn-
lye nor more fully declareth þ saine,
than dothe S. Paule, partly in the io.
Chaptre, but especially in þ ii. Chap.
of his fyrst epistle to þ Corinthianes.
As Matthewe and Marke doo agree
muche in wordes, so do likewise Luke
and S. Paule. But al. iiiij. no doubt, as
they were all caught in one schole, &
inspired w̄ one spirite, so taught they
all one truthe. God graunt vs to vn-
derstande it well. Amen.

Matthewe setteth furthe Christes
supper thus.

Matb. 26
Whan euē was come, he sate downe w̄
the. xiij. &c. As they did eate, Jesus toke
bread, and gaue thankes, brake it, and
gaue it to the disciples, and sayed. Take,
eate, This is my body. And he toke the
cuppe

cuppe, gave thankes , gave it to them
sayeng: Drynke ye al of this: for this is
my blood of the newe testament , that
is shedde for many , for the Remission
of synnes. I saye vnto you , I will not
drynke hencefurthe of this frute of the
vyne tree,vntil that daye, whan I shall
drynke that newe in my fathers king=
dome. And whā they hadde sayed grace,
they went out. &c.

Now Marke speaketh it thus. And
as they eate, JESUS TOKE bread, blessed,
and brake, and gaue to them, and saied:
Take,eate, This is my body. And he
toke the cuppe, gave thankes, and gaue it
to them, and they all dranke of it. And
he sayed vnto them: This is my blood
of the newe testament, which is shedde
for many. Verily I saye vnto you, I wil
drinke no more of the frute of the vyne,
vntil that daye , that I drinke that
newe,in the kingdome of God.

Mar.14.

Here Matthewe and Marke do a-
gree not only in þ mater , but also al-
most fully in the forme of wordes. In
Matthewe gaue thankes. Marke hathe
one worde, Blessed :which signifieth
in this place all one. And where Mat

A 4 thewe

þeþwe sayeth: Srynke ye all of this:
Marke sayeth: they al dranke of it. And
þwer Mattheþwe sayeth: of this frute
of þ vynë: Marke leaueth out þ worde
(this) and sayeth, of þ frute of the vynë.

Luke, 22.

Now let vs see likewise, what a-
greement (in forme of wordes) is be-
twene S. Luke and S. Paule. Luke
wryterh thus: He toke bread, gaue thā
kes, brake it, and gaue it to them, sayēg:
This is my body which is geuē for you
This doo in the remembraunce of me.
Likewise also whan they hadde supped,
he toke the cupp, sayeng: This cuppe is
the newe testament in my blood, which
is shedde for you.

1. Cor. 11.

Saint Paule setteth furthe þ Lor-
des supper thus. The Lorde Jesus, the
same night, in the which he was be-
trayed, toke bread, and gaue thankes, &
brake, and sayed: Take, eate: this is my
body, which is broken for you. This doo
in remembraunce of me. After the same
maner he toke the cuppe, whan supper
was done, sayeng This cuppe is the
newe testament in my blood. This doo,
as often as ye shall drinke it, in the re-
mēbraunce of me. For as often as ye shall
eate this bread, & drinke this cuppe, ye
shall

shal shewe þ Lordes death, vntil he come
Here wher Luke sayeth, which is
geuen: Paule sayeth, which is broken.
And as Luke addeth to the wordes of
Paule spoken of the suppe (which is
shedde for you) so likewise Paule ad-
deth to the wordes therof, This doo,
as often as you shall drinke it in the re-
membraunce of me. The rest that folo-
weth in S. Paule bothe ther and in þ
io. chap. perteyneth vnto the right vse
and doctrine of the Lordes supper,

Thus the Euangelistes & S. Paule
haue rehearsed the wordes & worke
of Christ, wherby he did institute & or-
dayne this holy sacramet of his body
& blood, to be a perpetuall remembraunce
vnto his comyng again of him self
(I saye) þ is of his body geue for vs, &
of his blood shedde for þ remission of
synnes. But this remembraunce which
is thus ordayned, as þ autor therof is
Christ (bothe God and man) so by the
almightie power of God, it farre pas-
seth all kyndes of remembraunces,
that any other man is able to make
wyther of hym selfe or of any other
thing. For who so euer receaueth this
holy sacramet thus ordayned in re-
membraunce of Christ, he receaueth ther

A 5 with

With either deathe or life. In this (I
trust) we doo all agree. For S. Paule
sayeth of þ godly receauours in þ 10.
chap. of his furst epistle vnto the Co-
rinthias: The cuppe of blessing, which
we blesse, is it not the partaking or felo-
weship of Christes blood? And also he
sayeth. The bread which we breake (&
meaneth at the Lordes table) is it not
the partaking or feloweship of Christes
bodye? Now the partaking of Christes
body and of his blood vnto the faith-
full and godly, is the partaking or fe-
loweship of life & immortalitie. And a-
gayn of the badde and vngodly recea-
vours, S. Paule as playnly sayeth
thus: He that eateth of this bread, eand
drynketh of this cuppe unworthily : is
giltie of the body and blood of þ Lorde.
O how necessary þa it is, if we loue
life, & wolde eschue deathe, to trye and
examine our selues, before we eate of
this bread, and drynke of this cuppe:
for elles assuredly, he that eateth and
drynketh therof unworthily, eateth &
drynketh his owne damnacion, bicau-
se he esteemeth not the Lordes body: þ
is, he reverenceth not the Lordes bo-
dye w þ honour that is due vnto him.

And that which was sayd, that w
the

Note.

the receipt of the holy Sacrament of
the blessed body and blood of Christ is
receaued of euery one , good & badde,
either life or deathe, it is not mett, that
they which are dead before God, maie
hereby receaue life:or the lyuing be-
fore God can hereby receaue deathe.
For as non is mete to receaue natu-
ral fode, wherby þ natural life is nou-
rished, except he be borne & lufe before:
so no man ca fede (by the receipt of this
holy sacrament) of the fode of eternal
life, except he be regenerated & borne
of God before. And on the other syde,
no man here receaueth damnacion
which is not dead before.

Thus hiterto without all doubt,
God is my witnesse, I saye so farre as
I doo knowe , ther is no controuer-
sie among them that be learned , in
the churche of Englannde (concerning
the mater of this sacrament) but all
doo agree, whether they be newe or
olde:and to speake playne, and as som
of them doo odiously call either other:
whether they be protestauntes, papi-
stes, þharisees, or gospellers. And as
al doo agree hiterto, in þ aforesayed
doctrine, so al do deteste, abhorre & co-
denne þ wicked heresie of þ Messalonias
nes

*What it is
to lye.*

nes, whiche other wisse be called Eutis-
cheters, which said, þ þ holy Sacramēt
cā nother do good nor harme. Al do al-
so cōdēne those wicked Anabaptistes,
which put no difference betwene the
Lordes table and the lordes meale, &
their owne. And bicausle charitie
wolde, that we shold, (if it be possi-
ble, and so farre as we maye wth the
sauegarde of good cōscience, & mayn-
tenaunce of the truthe) agree wth all
men: therfore me thinkes, it is not
charitably done to burthen any man
(either newe or olde, as they cal them)
further, than such doo declare them
selues, to dissent from that we are
persuaded to be truthe, or pretende
thereto to be controuersies, wher as
non suche are in dede: and so to mul-
tiplie the debate, the whiche the more
it dothe encrease, the further it dothe
departe from the vnitie, that the trus-
christian shold desyre.

And agayn, this is true, that tru-
the nother nedeth nor wilbe mayn-
teyned wth lies. It is also a true pro-
uerbe, that it is euē synne, to lye vpon
the devill: for though by thy lye thou
doest synne neuer so muche to speake
agaynst the devill, yet in þ thou lyest,

in dede shou workest the deuilles
worke: shou doest him seruice, and
cakest the deuilles parte. Now whe-
ther than they doo godly and charita-
bly, which either by their pen in wri-
ting, or by their wordes in preaching,
doo beare the symple people in hate,
that those whiche thus doo teache & be-
leue, doo goo about to make the holy
Sacrament (ordayned by Christ him
self) a thing no better than a piece of
common bread: or that doo saye, that
suche doo make the holy Sacrament
of the blesed body and blood of Christ
nothing elles, but a bare signe or a
figure, to represent Christ non other-
wise, than the Iuye bushe dothe re-
present the wyne in a tauerne, or as a
vile persone gorgioulye apparailed,
maye represent a kyng or a prince in
a playe. Alas let men leaue lyeng,
and speake the truthe euery one, not
only to his neighbour, but also of his
neighbour: for we are membres one
of an other, sayeth saint Paule. The
controversie (no doubt) which at this
daye troubleth the churche (wherin
any meane learned man, either olde
or newe, dothe stande in) is now, whe-
ther the holy Sacrament of the body

and

The flaſſe
derous lies
of the paſſ
pistes.

and blood of Christ, is no better than
a piece of comō bread or no: or whe-
ther the Lordes table is no more to be
regarded, thā the table of any earthy
man or no: or whether it is but a bare
signe or figure of Christ and nothing
elles or no. For all doo graunt, that
S. Paules wordes doo require, that
the bread which we breake, is the par-
taking of the body of Christ, and also
doo graunt hym that eateth of that
bread, or drinke of þ cuppe unwor-
thily, to be giltie of the Lordes death,
and to eate and drinke his owne
damnacion, bicause he estemeth not
the Lordes body. All doo graunt, that
these wordes of S. Paule (whan he
sayeth: If we eate, it auantageth vs no
thing: or if we eate not we want nothig
therby) are not spoken of the Lordes
table, but of other common meates.

*wherin
the contro-
uersy con-
sistib.*

Thus thā hitherto yet, we al agree.
But now let vs see, wherin the dissen-
sion dothe stande. The vnderstanding of
it, wherin it chieflī stādeth, is a steppe
to the true searching furthe of the
truth. For who can seke well a reme-
die, if he knowe not before, þ disease?
It is nother to be denied nor dissem-
bled, that in the mater of this Sacra-
ment

met ther be diuerse poyntes, wherina
men (counted to be learned) can not
agree. As whether ther be any Trans-
substantiation of the bread, or no: any
corporal & carnall presence of Christes
substaunce, or no: Whether adoracion
(due onlye vnto God) is to be done
vnto the Sacrament or no: and whe-
ther Christes bodye be ther offred in
dede vnto þ heauely father, by þ priest
or no: and whether þ euil man receas-
ueth the naturall bodye of Christ or
no. yet neverthelesse as in a man dis-
eased in dyuerse partes, commonlye
the originall cause of suche diuerse
diseases, which is spredde abroade
in the body, doo come from one chefe
meinbre, as from the stomacke, or
from the head: euен so all syue afore-
sayed doo chiefly heng vpon this one
question: which is, what is the mater
of the Sacrament: whether is it the
naturall substaunce of bread, or the
natural substaunce of Christes owne
body? The truthe of this question truly
tryed out and agreed vpon, no doubt
shal ceasse the controuersie in al þ rest.
For if it be Christes owne natural
body, borne of the virgine: than assu-
redly (seeing that all learned men in
England

Englande so farre as I knowe, bothe
newe & olde, graunt there to be but one
substaunce) than I saye, they must ne-
des graunt Transubstanciacion: that
is , a chaunge of þ substaunce of bread,
into the substaunce of Chристes bodye.
Thā also they must nedes graunt the
carnall and corporal presence of Chri-
stes bodye. Than must the Sacramēt
be adored with þ honour due to Chriſt
him ſelſe, for the vnitie of the two na-
tures in one persone. Than yf þ prieſt
do offre the Sacramēt, he dothe offre
in dede Chriſt him ſelſe. And finally
the murtherour, the aduouterour, or
wicked man receauing the Sacramēt,
must nedes than receaue also the na-
tural substaunce of Chристes owne bleſ-
ed bodye, bothe fleshe and blood.

Nowe on þ other syde , yf after the
truthe ſhalbe truly tryed out, it ſhaibe
founde , that the substaunce of bread is
the naturall substaunce of the Sacra-
ment, although for the chaunge of the
vſe, office and dignitie of þ bread , the
bread in dede sacramentally is chaun-
ged into the bodye of Chriſt, as the wa-
ter in Baptisme is sacramentally chaun-
ged into the fountain of regeneration,
& yet the natural substaunce ther-

of remayneth all one, as was before :
yf (I say) the true solucion of that for=mer question (wherupon al these con=trouerries do heng) be , that the natu=rall substance of bread , is the mate=rial substance in the Sacrament of Christes blessed body: than must it ne=des folowe, of the former proposition (confessed of all that be named to be learned , so farre as I do knowe , in Englande) which is , that ther is but one material substance in the Sacra ment of the bodye, and one only lyke=wise in the Sacrament of the bloob: that ther is no suche thing in dede and in truthe, as they call Transubstanci=acion: for the substance of bread re=mayneth stil in the Sacrament of the bodye: than also the natural substance of Christes humane nature, which he toke of the virgine Mary is in heauē , where it reigneth nowe in glorie, and not here inclosed vnder the forme of bread: than that godly honour, which is only due unto God h̄is creatour, may not be done unto the creature without idolatrie and sacrilege , is not so to be done unto the holy Sacrament .

Than also the wicked, I meane the impenitēt murtherour, aduouterour,

or such like, do not receave the natural substance of þ blessed body & blood of Christ. Finally thā dothe it folowe, þ Christes blessed body & blood, which was once only offred & shedde vpon the crosse, being auailable for the sinnes of al the hole worlde, is offred vp no more, in the natural substance therof, nother by þ priest no; any other thing. But here before we go any further to searche in this mater, & to wade (as it were) to search & trye out (as we may) þ truthe hereof in the scripture, it shall do wel by the way, to knowe, whether they that thus make answeare & solucion vnto the former principal question, do take awaie symplie and absolutly the presence of Christes body & blood, from the Sacrament ordayned by Christ, and duely ministred according to his holy ordinance and instituciō of the same. Undoubtedly they doo denye that utterly, either so to saye, or so to meane. Hereof yf any man do or will doubt, the bookeſ which are writte already in this mater of them, that thus doo answeare, will make the mater playne.

Now than wil you say, what kynd of presence do they graunt, & what do they

they denye? Bryelly they denie the presence of Christes body in the naturall substance of his humane & assumption nature, and graunt the presence of the same by grace: that is , they affirme and saye, that the substance of the naturall body and blood of Christ is onlye remayning in heauen, and so shal be vnto the later daye , whan he shall come agayne in glorie (accompained with the Angelles of heaven) to iudge bothe the quicke and the deade. And that the same natural substance of the very bodye & blood of Christ , bycause it is united vnto the divine nature in Christ hys secōde person of the Trinitie. Therfore it hath not onlye lyfe in it selfe, but is also hable to geue & dothe geue lyfe vnto so many as be or shal be partakers therof : that is, v̄ to all þ do beleue on his name, which are not borne of blood (as S. Io. sayeth) or of þ wil of þ fleshe, or of þ wil of man, but are borne of God: though the selfe same substance abyde styll in heauen, and they for the tyme of their pilgrimage dwel here vpon earthe: By grace (I saye) that is , by the gyfte of thys lyfe(mencioned in John) and the propreties of the same , mete for our

pilgrimage here vpon earth, the same
bodye of Christ is here preset with vs.
Euen as for example, we saye, þ same
Sunne which(in substance)never re-
moueth his place out of the heauens,
is yet present here by his beames,
light, and naturall influence, where it
shyneth vpon the earthe. For Goddes
worde and his Sacramentes be(as it
were)the beames of Christ, which is
Sol iusticie, the Sunne of ryghteousnes.

Thus haste thou hearde, of what
sorte or secte so euer thou be, wherin
dothe stande the principall state and
chiefe point of all the controviersies,
which doþprely perseyne vnto the na-
ture of this Sacrament. As for the vse
therof, I graunt ther be many other
thinges, wherof here I haue spoken
nothyng at all. And now least thou in-
stly myghtest complayne, and say, that
I haue in opening of this mater dons
nothyng elles, but digged a pitte, and
haue not shut it vp again: or broken a
gap, & hane not made it vp agayne: or
opened þ boke, & haue not closed it a-
gayne: or elles to cal me what thou lu-
kest, as neutrall, dissembler, or what
so euer elles thy lust & learnyng shall
serue to thee to name me worse.

Ther-

Therefore here now I wil (by Goddes
grace) not only shortly but so cleare-
ly, playnly as I can make hym to know,
whether of þe aforesaid two answeres
to þe former principal state & chief post
dothe lyke me best: yea and also I will
holde al those accursed, which in this
mater (þe now so troubleth þe churche
of Christ) haue of God receaued the
keye of knowlage, & yet goo about to
shutte vp þy doores so, þy they them selues
wil not entre in, nor suffre other that
wolde. And as for myne owne parte,
I colydre, bothe of late what charge &
cure of soule hathe ben comited vnto
me, wherof God knoweth, howe
sone I shalbe called to geue accōpte: &
also now in this worlde, what perille &
daunger of þy lawes (concernyng my life)
I am now in at this p̄sēt tyme. What
folyshe where it thā for me, now to disse-
ble w̄ God, of whō assuredly I loke &
hope by Christ to haue everlastig lifer.
Seing þy suche charge & daunger (bothe
before God & man) doo compasse me in
roude about on euery syde: therfore
(God willing) I will frankly & frely
uttre my mynde, & though my body
be captiue, yet my tōgue & my pen (as
long as I maye) shall frely set furthe,

B3 that

that whiche vndoubtedly I am persua-
ded to be þ truthe of Goddes woorde.
And yet I wil do it vnder this protec-
tacion, call me protestant who listeth.
I passe not therof. My protestacion
shalbe thus: that my mynde is & euer
shalbe (God willing) to set furthe syn-
cerely the true sense and meanyng (to
the best of my vnderstanding) of God-
des most holy woorde, & not to decline
from the same, either for feare of
worldly daunger, or elles for hope of
gayne.

I doo proteste also due obedience &
submission of my iudgement in this
my wryting, and in all other myne af-
fares vnto those of Christes church,
which be truly learned in Goddes ho-
ly woorde, gathered in Christes name,
and guided by his spirite. After this
protestacion, I doo playnly affirme
and saye, þ the seconde answer made
vnto the chief question and principal
poynt, I am persuaded to be the very
true meanyng and sense of Goddes
holy woorde: that is, that the naturall
substaunce of bread and wyne is the
true material substaunce of the holy
sacrament of the blessed body & blood
of our sauour Christ: and the places
of

*Answer to
the chief
question*

of scripture, wherupon this my faithe
is grounded, be these, bothe cōcerning
þ sacramēt of þ body, & also of þ blood.

Furst let vs repeate the begynnyng
of the instituciō of the Lordes supper,
wherin al þ three euāgelistes, and S.
Paule almost in wordes doo agree,
sayeng that Jesus toke bread, gaue þā
kes, brake, and gaue it to the disciples,
sayeng. Take, eate, this is my body.
Here it appeareth playnly, that Christ
calleth very bread his body. For that
which he toke, was very bread. In
this all me doo agree. And that which
he toke, after he hadde geuen thankes,
he brake: and that which he toke and
brake, he gaue to his disciples: & that
which he toke, brake, and gaue to his
disciples, he sayed hym self of it: This
is my bodye. So it appareth playnlie,
that Christ called very bread his body.
But very breading can not be his body in
very substance therof: therfore it must
nedes haue an other meanīg. Which
meanyng appeareth playnly what it
is, by the next sentence that followeth
immediatlye, bothe in Luke & in Paule.
And þ is this: Doo this in remēbraūce
of me. Wherupon it semeth vnto

Argumed

me to be evident, that Christ did take
bread, & called it his bodye, for that he
wolde therby institute a perpetual re-
membrance of his body: specially of þ
singular benefite of our redempcion,
which he wolde than procure and
purchase vnto vs, by his body vpon
the crosse. But bread reservynge still
his owne very natural substance,
maye be thus by grace, (and in a sa-
cramental significacio) his body: wher-
as elles the very bread which he toke,
brake, and gaue them, could not be in
any wise his natural body. For that
were confusion of substances, and
therfore the very wordes of Christ
ioyned with the next sentence folo-
wing, bothe enforceth vs to confesse
the very bread, to remayne still, and
also openeth vnto vs, how that bread
may be and is thus by his divine po-
wer his body, which was geue forvs.
But here I remembre, I haue red in
some wrotours of the contrarie opi-
nion, which doo denye that, þ which
Christ did take, he brake. For (saye
they) after his taking, he blessed it, as
Marke doth speake. And by his bles-
sing, he chaunged the natural sub-
staunce of the breade vnto the natu-
ral

ral substance of his bodye: and so al-
though he toke the bread, and blessed
it, yet because in blessing he chaun-
ged the substance of it, he brake not
the bread, which than was not ther,
.but only the forme therof.

Unto this obiection I haue two
playne answers, bothe grounded vpon
Goddes worde. The one I will here
rehearse: the other answer I will dif-
ferre, until I speake of the Sacramet
of the blood. Myne answer here is ta-
ke out of y plaine wordes of S. Paul,
which doche manifestlye confounde
this fantastical inuencion, furst inue-
ted (I wene) of Pope Innocentius, &
after confirmed by the subtle sophis-
ter Duns, and lately renewed nowe
in our dayes, with an eloquent stile &
muche finesse of wytte. But what can
craftye inuencion, subteltie in sophis-
mes, eloquence or synesse of wytte pre-
uayle against the unsallible worde of
God? What nede we to striue and co-
tend what thing we breake, for Paul
sayeth, speaking vndoubtedly of the
Lordes table: The bread (sayeth he)
which we breake, is it not the parta-
king or feloweship of the Lordes bodye?
Wherupon it foloweth, that after the

A 5 than-

Mar.
Antho.
confi.
Gardiner

Act. 2.20.

thakes getynge it is bread whiche we
breake. And how oftē in the Actes of þ
apostles, is the Lordes supper signifi-
ed by breaking of bread: They did per-
seuer (sayeth S. Luke) in the Apostles
doctrin, cōmunion, & breakynge of bread.
And they brake bread in euery house.
And again i an other place, whā they
were come together to break bread &c.
S. Paul which setteth furth most fully
in his wyrting bothe the doctrine & þ
right vse of þ Lordes supper, & þ sacra-
mental eating & draking of Christes bd-
dy & blod, calleth it fyue times bread,
bread,bread,bread,bread.

*The. 2.
reason,*

The sacramental bread is the my-
sticall body, and so it is called in scrip-
ture 1. Cor. 10. as it is called the natu-
ral body of Christ. But Christes mysti-
cal body is the congregacion of christi-
anes. Now nomā was cuer so sonde,
as to saye, that that sacramental bread
is transubstantiated and chaunged in
to the substance of the congregacio.
Wherfore no man should likewise
thinke, or saye, þ þ bread is transubstan-
tiated & chaunged in to þ natural sub-
stance of Christes humayne nature.

But my mynde is not here to wryte
what maye be gathered out of scriptu-

vss

res for this purpose ; but only to note
here briefly , those which seeme vnto
me, to be the most playne places. Ther-
fore contented to haue spoken thus
muche of the sacramental bread, I will
now speake a litel of þ Lordes cuppe.

And this shalbe my thrid argumēt
grouded vpō Christes owne wordes.
The natural substance of the sacra-
mental wyne remayneth still, and is
þ material substance of the sacrament
of þ blood of Christ: Therfore it is like-
wise so in þ Sacramental bread.

I know that he that is of a contrary
opinion, wil denye the former parte
of myne Argument. But I wil proue
it thus, by the playne wordes of Christ
him self , bothe in Mathewe and in
Marke. Christes wordes are these: af-
ter the wordes said vpō the cup. I saie
vnto you (saith Christ) I wil not drinke
hēcefurthe of this frute of the vyne tree,
vntil I shall drinke that newe in my fa-
thers kingdome. Here note how Christ
 calleth playnlie his cuppe the frute
of the vyne tree. But the frute of
the vyne tree is very natural wyne.
Wherfore the natural substance of
the wyne dothe remayne still in the
Sacrament of Christes blood .

The.3.
Argumēt.

Ind

And here in speaking of þ Lordes cup,
it cometh vnto my remembraunce þ
vanitie of Innocentius his satanical
inuencion, which by Paules wordes
þ did confute before, & here did pro-
mise somewhat more to speake, & that
is this. If the transubstanciation be
made by this worde (Blessed) in
Marke sayed vpon the bread, as In-
nocentius that pope did saye: Than su-
rely seeing that worde is not sayed of
Christ, nother in any of the euangeli-
cles nor in S. Paule vpon the cuppe:
þher is no transubstanciacion of the
wyne at al. For wher the cause dothe
faile, ther can not folowe the effecte.
But the sacramental bread & the sacra-
mental wyne doo bothe remayne in
their natural substance alike, and if
the one be not chaunged, as of the sa-
cramental wyne it appeareth euidet-
ly: than ther is no such transubstanci-
acion in nother of them bothe,

All that put & affirme this chaunge
of þ substance of bread & wyne in to
the substance of Christes bodye and
blood(called Transubstanciation)doo
also say this chaunge to be made by a
certain forme of prescripte wordes
and non other. But what they be that
make

The papis
stesaffirme
they wotte
not what

make the chaunge, either of the one
or of the other, vndoubtedly eue they
that doo write most synely in these
our dayes, almost confesse playnlye,
that they can not tell. For although
they graunt, to certayn of the olde au-
tors, as Crysostome and Ambrose: that
these wordes (This is my body) are the
wordes of consecracion of the sacra-
ment of the body: yet saye they, these
wordes maye well be so called, because
they doo assure vs of the consecracion
therof, whether it be done before these
wordes be spoken or no.

But as for this their doubt (con-
cerning the sacrament of the bodye)
I let it passe. Let vs now considre the
wordes which perteyne to the cuppe.
This is furst euident, y as Mattheue
muche agreeeth w Marke, & likewise
Luke with Paule, much agreeeth herin
in forme of wordes: so in the saime, the
forme of wordes in Mattheue and
Marke is diuerse fr̄ that which is in
Luke & Paule: y olde autors doo most
rehearsle y forme of wordes in Mat-
theue & Marke: because I wene they
semed to th̄ most cleare. But here I
wold knowe, whether it is credible or
no, that Luke and Paule, whan they
celebra

Gardiner
to the 48.
objection.

celebrated the Lordes supper w^t these
congregaciones, that they did not vse
the same forme of wordes (at the Lor-
des table) which they wrote, Luke in
his gospel, and Paule in his epistle.
Of Luke, because he was a phisicion,
whether some will graunt, that he
might be a priest or no, and was ha-
ble to receave h^t ordre of priesthooде,
which (they saye) is geuen by vertue
of these wordes layed by the bishop:
Take ihou autoritie to sacrifice for the
quycke and the dead. I can not tell,
but if they shoulde be so strayt vpon
Luke, either for his crafte, or elles for
lacke of such power geuen him by
vertue of thaforsaid wordes: than I
wene, bothe Petre and Paule are in
daungier to be deposed of their priest-
hood, for the crafte either of sything,
which was Petres: or making of
serues which was Paules, were more
vile, than the the science of phisike.
And as for those sacramental wordes
of the ordre of Priesthooде to haue
autoritie to sacrifice bothe for h^t quyc
and the dead, I wene Petre & Paule
(yf they were bothe alyue) were not
hable to prone, that euer Christ gaue
them such autoritie, or euer saied any
such

Petre and
Paule had
no such
priesthode
as the pa-
pistes haue

Sache wordes vnto them. But I will
let Luke goo, and because Paule spea-
keth more for hym self, I will rehear-
se his wordes: That (sayeth Paule)
which I receaued of the Lorde I gaue
vnto you. For the Lorde Jesus, &c. And
so he setteth farrth the hole institutio &
right vse of the Lordes supper. Now
seeing that Paule here sayeth, that
which he receaued of the Lorde, he
hade geuen them, and that which he
hath receaued and geuen them before
by worde of mouthe, now he rehear-
seth & wryteth the same in his epistle:
is it credible that Paule wolde never
use this forme of wordes, vpon the
Lordes cuppe, which (as he sayeth) he
receaued of the Lorde, that he hade ge-
uen them before, and now rehearseth
in his Epistle? I trust no man is so
farre from all reaso, but he wil graunt
me, that this is not likely so to be.
Now than if you graunt me, that
Paule did vse the forme of wordes,
which he wryteth: Let vs than rehe-
arse and considre Paules wordes,
which he sayeth, Christ spake thus vp
on þ cup. This cup is the new testamēt
in my blood: this do as often as ye shal
dranke it, in the remembraunce of me.

Heres

Here I wold knoswe, whether that
Christes wordes spoke vpon the cuppe,
were not as myghtye in worke, and
as effectuall in significacion to all in-
tentes, constructiones and purposes
(as our Parliamēt men doo speake)
as they were spoken vpon the bread.
If this be graunted, which thing I
thinke no man can denye: than fur-
ther I reaso thus. But the worde (is)
in the wordes spoken vpon the Lordes
bread dothe myghtily signifie (saye
they) the chaunge of the substance of
that which goeth before it, in to þe sub-
stance of þe which foloweth after, þe is,
of the substance of bread in to the
substaunce of Christes bodye, whan
Christ sayeth: This is my bodye. Now
than if Christes wordes which are
spoken vpon the cuppe, which Paule
here rehearseth be of the same myght
and power, bothe in working and sig-
nifieng: Than must this worde (is)
whan Christ sayeth: This cuppe is the
newe testament & turne the substance
of the cuppe in to the substance of
the newe testament. And if thow wile
saye, that this worde (is) n̄ other ma-
beth nor signifieth any suche chaunge
of the cuppe, although it be saide of
Christ,

Christ, that this cuppe is the newe testa-
ment , yet Christ ment no suche
chaunge, as that. Mary Sir, euē so
saye I, whā Christ sayde of the bread,
whch he toke, and after thankes ge-
uen brake and gaue them , sayeng :
Take, eate , this is my body, he ment
no more any suche chaunge of the
substaice of bread in to the substaice
of his naturall bodye, than he ment of
the chaunge and Transubstantiacion
of the cuppe in to the substaunce of
the newe testament. And if thow wil
saye, that the worde (cuppe) here in
Christes wordes dothe not signifie
the cuppe it self, but the wyne, or thīg
concerned in the cuppe, by a figure
called Metonymia, for y Christes wor-
des ment, and so must nedes be take:.
thow sayest very well. But I praye
the by the waye, here note two thin-
ges. First that this worde (is) hache
no suche streynght or significacion in
the Lordes wordes, to make or to sig-
nifie any transubstantiacion. Secōd=
ly, that the Lordes wordes wherby he
instituted the sacramēt of his blood,
he blesch a figuratyne speache. Now
wyne than is it, that some so earnest-
ly doo saye, as it were an infallible

Note
well the
Papistes
error con-
futed.

C rule

rule, that in doctrine & in the institutio-
on of the sacramentes, Christ useth no
figures, but all his wordes are to be
strayned to their propre significaciōs:
Whā as here what so euer thou sayest
Was in þ cuppe, nother þ nor the cuppe
selfe (taking every worde in his pro-
pre significaciō) was þ newe testamēt,
but in vnderstanding that which was
in the cuppe, by the cuppe þ is a figura-
tive speache: yea & also thou cannest
not verifie or truly save of that, whe-
ther thou sayest it was wyne or Chri-
stes blood, to be the newe testamēt
without a figure also. Thus in one sen-
tence spoken of Christ, in the institu-
tion of the sacrament of his blood, the
figure must helpe vs twyse. So vn-
true is it, that some doo wryte, that
Christ useth no figure in the doctrine
of faythe, nor in the institution of his
Sacramentes. But some saye, yf we
shal thus admitte figures in doctrine,
than shall all the articles of our fayth,
by figures and allegories shortlye be
transformed and vnlosed. I saye it is
lyke fault (& euē the same) to deny þ fi-
gure, where þ place so requireth to be
vnderstanden, as baynely to make it
a figuratiue speache, which is to be vn-

det.

verstāden in his propre signification.

The rules wherby þ speche is knowne, whan it is figuratiue, & wherby it is none, S. Augustine in his boke *De doctrina christiana*, geueth diuerse learned lessons, very necessarie to be knowne of þ studentes in Goddes worde. Of the which, one I will rehearse which is thys. If (sayeth he) the scripture dothe semē to commānde a thing, which is wicked or vngodly: or to forbiddē a thing that charitie dothe require, than kno wel thou (sayeth he) that the speche is figuratiue. And for exāple he bringeth the sayeng of Christ, in þ. c. chap. of S. Jo. Except ye eate the fleshe of the sone of man, & drinke his blood, ye can not haue lyfe in yon: it semeth to comānde a wicked or an vngodly thing. Wherfore it is a figuratiue speche, commanding to haue cōmuniō & felowship w̄ Christes passiō, & devoutly & holsomlye to laye vp in memorie, that his fleshe was crucified and wounded for vs.

And here I can not but maruel at some men, surely of muche excellēt synesse of wyt, & of great eloquēce, that are not ashamed to wryte & say, þ this aforesaid sayeng of Christ is after S. Austin a figuratiue speche in dede:

C 2 howz

Aug. Dc
Doc. chris-
tiana. li.
3. ca. 16.

Gardiner
in his answ-
ers to the
161. & 22. obiection,
Note,

howbeit not vnto the learned, but so
the unlearned. Here let any man that
but indifferently understandeth the
latine tongue, read the place in S.
Augustin: & if he perceave not clearly S.
Augustines wordes & mynde to be co-
trary, let me abyde therof the rebuke.

This lessō of S. Augustine I haue
therfore the rather set furthe, because
it teacheth vs to vnderstande that place
in John figuratuyely. Euen so sure-
ly the same lesson with the example
of S. Augustines expoziciones therof,
teacheth vs not only by the same, to
vnderstande Christes wordes in the
institucion of the Sacrament bothe
of his body and of his blood figuraty-
uely, but also the very true meanyng
and vnderstanding of the same. For
if to commaunde to eate the fleshe of
the sonne of man, and to drinke his
blood semeth to commaunde an in-
conuenience and an vngodlynnesse, and
is euē so in dede, if it be vnderstandē
as thē wordes doo stāde in their pro-
pre significacion: and therfore must
be vnderstanden figuratuyely & spiri-
tually, as S. Augustine dothe godly
and learnedly interprete them: Than
surely Christ commaunding in his
last

last supper to eate his body, and to
drinke his blood, seemed to comande
in sounde of wordes, as great and
even the same inconuenience and vn-
godlinessse, as did his wordes in the s.
chap. of S. Iohn: and therfore must
even by the same reason, be lykewise
vnderstanden and expounded figura-
tively & spirituallly, as S. Augustine
did the other: Wherunto that exposi-
cion of S. Augustine may seeme to be
the more mete, for that Christ in his
supper, to the commaundement of ea-
ting and drinking of his body & blood
addeþ, Doo this in the remembraunce
of me. Which wordes surely were the
keye, that opened & reuealed the spiri-
tuall and godly expositio[n] vnto S.
Augustine.

But I haue taried longer in set-
ting furthe þ forme of Christes wo-
rdes vpon the Lordes cuppe, written
by Paule and Luke, than I did intede
to do. And yet in speaking of the forme
of Christes wordes, spoken vpon his
cuppe, cometh now to my remembraunce
the forme of wordes vsed in the latine
Mass, vpon the Lordes cuppe. Wher-
as the p[ri]e of I doo not a litell maruaile, what f[ri]es say.
The Lor-
des cuppe,
as the p[ri]e
f[ri]es say.

Masse agreeeth with the euangelistes
and Paule , in the forme of wordes
sayed vpon the bread: why in the wor-
des sayed vpon the Lordes cuppe , it
diffreth from them all, yea and addeth
to the wordes of Christ spoken vpon
the cuppe, these wordes, *Misterium fidei*,
that is, the mysterie of faith, which ar
not redde to be attributed vnto the sa-
crament of Christes blood , nother in
the euangelistes nor in Paule , nor so
farre as I knowe, in any other place
of holy scripture : yea and if it maye
hau som good expositio[n], yet why it
should not be aswell added vnto the
wordes of Christ vpon his breade , as
vpon his cuppe, surely I doo not see þ
mysterie. And bicausle I see in the vse
of the latine masse the sacrament of þ
blood abused, whan it is denied vnto
the laye people, cleane contrary vnto
Goddes most certaine wordes: for why,
I doo beseeche the, shoulde the sacrament
of Christes blood be denied vnto the
lay christia[n]e, more thā to þ priest ? Doo
not Christ sheade his blood aswell for
þ laye godly man, as for þ godly priest ?
If thou wilt saye, yeas that he did so.

Buc

But yet þ sacramēt of the blood is noe
to be receaued without the offring vp
þ sacrificeing therof vnto God the fa-
ther, bothe for the quicke and for the
dead: and no man maye make oblation
of Christes blood vnto God , but a
priest, and therfore the priest alone (þ
that but in his Massē only) maye re-
ceauē the sacramēt of the blood. And
call you this (Maisters) Mīsterium fidei? 2. Thess. 2.
Alas alas , I feare me this is before
God Mīsterium iniquitatis, the misterie of
iniquitie, luche as S. Paule speakeþ
of, in his epistle to the Thessalonians.
The Lorde be mercifull vnto vs , and
blesse vs , lighten his countenaunce
vpon vs, and be mercifull vnto vs.
That we may knowe thy waye vpon
earthe, and among ail people thy sal-
uacion.

This kynde of oblation standeth
vpon Transubstanciacion his coulbyn
germayne, and they doo growe bothe
þþo one groude. The lord wede it out
of his vineyard shortly (if it be his bles-
sed wil & pleasure) þ bitter roote. To
speake of this oblation, how muche is
it iniurious vnto Christes passion?

Prayer.
Psal. 67.

The masse
sacrifice
iniurious
to Christes passion

Hebr. 9.
30.

Gardiner
in the an=
swer to
the 15. ob=
jection.

How it can not, but with highe blasphemye and haynous arrogauncie, & intolerable prude, be claimed of any man, other than of Christ hym selfe: how much and how playnly it repugneth vnto the manifest wordes, the true sense and meaning of holy scripture in many places, especially in the epistle to the Hebrues: the mater is so long, and other haue written in it at large, that my mynde is nowe, not to intreate therof any furher. For onlye in this my scribbling, I intende to search out and set furth by the scriptures (according to Goddes gracious gifte of my poore knowlage) whether the true sense and meaning of Christes wordes in þ instituciō of his holy supper, do requyre any Trāsubstāciō, as they cal it: or that the very substance of bread and wyns doo remayne still in the Lordes supper and be the material substance of the holy Sacrament of Christ our sauourys blessed body and blood. yet ther remayneth one dayne Quidde of Duns in this mater, þ which because some that write now doo seeme to like it so well, that they haue strypped him out of Dunces dunstyce and darke ter= mes

nes, and pricked hym and paynted
hym in freshe colours of an eloquent
stile: & may therfore deceave the more,
except the errour be warely eschued.

Duns sayeth in these wordes of
Christ, This is my body, this pro-
nowne demonstratyue, meanyng the
worde (this) if ye will knowe, what it
dothe shewe or demonstrate, whether
þ b̄read that Christ toke or no: he an-
swerech no, but only one thing in
substaunce it poynteth, wherof the
nature or name it dothe not tell, but
leauech that to be determinyd and
tolde by that which foloweth þ worde
(is) that is by *Prædicatum*, as the logici-
an dothe speake: and therfore he cal-
leth this pronowne demonstratiue
(This) *Individuum Vagum*, that is, a wā-
ding propre name, wherby we maye
poynt out and shewe any one thing
in substaunce, what thing so euer it
be. That this ymagination is bayne
and vntruly applyed vnto these wor-
des of Christ, This is my body: it may
appeare plainly in þ wordes of Luke
and Paule, sayed vpon the cuppe, co-
ferrred with þ forme of wordes spokē
vpon þ cuppe in Mathewe and Marke.
þo as vpon the b̄read it is sayed of al,

L 5 This

This is my body: so of Matthewe and
Marke it is sayed of the cuppe, This
is my blood. Than if in the wordes,
This is my body, the worde (this) be
(as Duns calleth it) a wādring name,
to appoynt and shewe furthe any oþe
thing, wherof the name and nature
it doþe not tell: so must it be likewyse
in those wordes of Matthewe and
Marke vpon the Lordes cuppe, This
is my blood. But in the wordes of
Matthewe and Marke, it signifieth
and poynteth out þ same, that it doþe
in the Lordes wordes vpon the cuppe
in Luke and Paule, wher it is sayd
This cuppe is the newe testament in
my blood. &c. Therfore in Matthewe
& Marke the þnowne demonstratiue
(this) doþe not wandre so poynt only
one thing in substance, nor shewing
what it is, but telleth it plainlie what
it is, no lesse in Matthewe and Marke
vnto the eie, than is done in Luke and
Paule, by puttig to this wordes(cuppe)
boþe vnto the eie, and vnto the eare.
For taking the cuppe and demonstra-
ting or shewing it vnto his disciples,
by this þnowne demonstratiue(this)
and sayeng vnto them, Drinke ye all
of this: it was than al one to say. This
is

is my blood, as to saye: This cuppe is
my blood, meanyng by the cuppe as
the nature of the speche dothe require,
the thing conreynd in the cuppe. So
likewise without all doubt, whan
Christ hadde taken bread, geuen than-
kes, and broken it, and gowing it
to his disciples sayed, Take: and so de-
monstrating and shewing that bread
which he hadde in his handes, to saye
than, This is my body: & to haue saied,
This bread is my body. As it were all
one, if a man lacking a knyfe, & goyng
to his oysters, wold say vnto an other,
whō he sawe to haue two kniues, Sir,
I praye you lende me the one of your
knyues. Were it not now all one to
answer hym, Sir, holde I will lende
you this to eate your meate, but not
to open oysters withall: and holde, I
will lende you this knyfe to eate
your meat, but not to open oysters.
This similitude serueth but for this
purpose, to declare y nature of speche
withall, wher as the thing that is de-
monstrated and shewed, is euidently
perceaued, and openly knowen to the
eie. But O good Loord, what a won-
derfull thing is it to see, how som me-
doo labour to teache, what is demon-
strated

straked and shewed by the pronowne
demonstratyue, this, in Christes wor-
des whan he sayeth: This is my body:
This is my blood: how they labour (I
saye) to teache , what that (this) was
than in dede, whā Christ spake in the
Card. 10
the. 13. ob.
action. begynnyng of the sentence the worde
(this) before he hade pronounced the
rest of the wordes, that folowed in the
same sentence: so that their doctrine
maye agree with their Transubstan-
ciacion: which in dede is the very sou-
dacion, wherin al their erroneous doc-
trine dothe stande. And here the Tran-

God ma-
kers agree
not among
them selues,
abm selu*n*
the wordes which wrought the Tran-
substanciacion, whan Christ did furst
institute his Sacrament: Wherin In-
nocentius a bishop of Rome of the later
dayes, and Duns (as was noised be-
fore) doo attribute the worke vnto the
worde (Benedixit) Blessed : but the rest
for the most parte, to Hoc est corpus meum,
This is my body. Et. Duns therfore w
his secte, because he putteth the chaunge
before, must nedes saye, y (this) whan
Christ spake it in the begynnyng of
the sentence, was in dede Christes bo-
dy. For in the chaunge, the substance
of

of bread did departe, and the chaunge
was now done in Benedixit (sayeth
he) that went before: and therfore af-
ter hym and his, that (this) was than
in dede Christes body, though þ wordē
did not impoſte so much, but only one
thing in ſubſtaunce: which ſubſtaun-
ce after Ouns (the bread being gone)
muſt nedes be the ſubſtaunce of Chri-
ſtes body. But they that put their Trā
ſubſtanciacion to be wrought by the-
ſe wordes of Chriſt, This is my body:
and doo ſaye, that whan the hole ſen-
tence was finished, than this chaunge
was perfected, and not before: they ca-
not ſaye, but yet Chriſtes (this) in the
begynnyng of the ſentence before the
other wordes were fully pronounced,
was bread in dede. But as yet þ chaun-
ge was not done, & ſo long the bread
muſt nedes remayne, and ſo long to
the uniuersal coſent of al transuſtaū-
tiacours, the naturall ſubſtaunce of
Chriſtes body can not come: and ther-
fore muſt their (this) of neceſſite dem-
onſtrate & ſhewe the ſubſtaunce, which
was as yet in the pronouiceing of the
firſt wordes (this) by Chriſt, but bread.
But how can they make and verifie
Chriſtes wordes to be true, demon-
ſtrat-

strating the substance which in the demonstration is but bread, and saye therof, This is my body: þ is (as they saye) the natural substance of Christes body: except they wold saye, that þ verbe (is) signifieth is made, or is chaunged in to. And so thā if the same verbe (is) be of þ same effecte in Christes wordes spoken vpō the cuppe, and rehearsed by Luke & Paule: the cuppe or the wyne in the cuppe must be made or turned in to the newe testamēt, as was declared before.

Gardiner
a Neutral
or Iacke
of bothe
Sydes.

There be som among the Transubstantiatours, which walke so mylylie and so warely betwene these two aforesaid opiniones, allowing them bothe, and holding playnly nother of them bothe, that me thynkes, they may be called Neutralles, Ambodexters, or rather suche as can shifte on bothe sydes. They plaiē on bothe partes. For with the later, they do allowe the doctrine of the last sillable, whiche is that transubstantiation is done by myracle in an instant, at þ sounde of the last sillable (*um*) in this sentence, *Hoc est corpus meum*. And they doo also allowe also Duns his fantastical imaginaciō of *Inuiuidum vagum*, that demonstrateth as he

as he reacheth, in Christes wordes,
one thing in substance, than being
(after his mynde) the substance of
the body of Christ.

A marueilous thing, how any man
can agree with bothe these two, they
being so contrarie the one to the other.
For the one sayeth, the worde (this)
demonstrateth the substance of bread:
and the other sayeth, no not so, the
bread is gone, and it demonstrateth
a substance which is Christes body.

Thus he sayeth this thrid man, ye
understante nothing at al. They agree
wel enough in the chief poynt, which
is the grounde of al: that is, bothe do
agree and beare witnesse, that ther
is transubstanciacion. They do agree
in dede in that conclusion: I graunt.
But their processe and doctrine therof
do euē as wel agree together, as did y^e
false witnessesse before Annas and Cai-
phas agaist Christ: or the two wicked
judges against Susanna. For agaist
Christ the false witnessesses did agre no
doubt, to speake all agaist hym. And
the wicked judges were bothe agreed
to condemne poore Susanna: but in
examinacion of their witnessesses, they
dissented so farre, that all was founde
false

Gard. to
the. 84 ob-
jection

Godma-
kers agree
against the
truthe.

Note

false, y they went about, both y wher
in they agreed, & also those thinges,
which they brought for their proues.

The con-
sent of the
olde au-
tors,

Thus muche haue I spoken, in
searching out a solucion for this prin-
cipal questio, which was, what is the
material substance of the holy Ha-
crament, in the Lordes supper. Now
least I shoulde seeme to set by myns
owne conceale, more than is mete: or
lesse to regarde the doctrine of the olde
ecclesiastical wrytours, than is conve-
nient for a man of my poore learning
and simple wytte so to doo. And bi-
cause also I am in dede persuaded, y
the olde ecclesiasticall wrytours un-
derstode the true meanyng of Christ
in this mater: and haue bothe so truly
and so playnly set it furthe in certayn
places of their wrytinges, that no man
which will bouchesafe to reade them,
and without preiudice of a corrupte
judgement wil indifferently weighe
the, & construe their myndes non other
wise, than they declare them selues to
haue ment: I am perswaded (I saye)
that in reading of them thus no man
can be ignorant in this mater, but
he that will shutte vp his owne eies,
and blyndfylde hym selfe. Whan I
speake

speake of ecclesiastical wryptours, I
meane of luche, as were before the
wicked usurpaciō of the sea of Rome
was growē so unmeasurably great,
that not only with tyrannical power,
but also with corrupte doctrine, it be-
ganne to subuerte Christes gospel, &
to turne the state, that Christ & his a-
postles set in þ church, upside downe.

For the causes aforesaid, I wil
rehearse certayn of their sayenges:
and yet because I take them but for
wytnesses and expouders of this doc-
trine, and not as the autors of the
same: and also for that now I wil not
be sedious, I will rehearse but fewe,
þ is three olde wryptours of the Breke
churche, and other three of the Latine
churche, which doo seme unto me, to
be in this mater most playne.

The Breke autors are Origene,
Chrisostome, and Theodore. The La-
tynne are, Tertulliane, S. Augustine
and Gelasius. I knowe ther can be
uothing spoken so playnly, but þ craf-
tive wryte furnished with eloquence,
can darken it, and wrasse it quite fro
þ true meaning to a contrary sēse. And
I knowe also, þ eloquence, crafte, and
synesse of wryte hathe gone about to

D bleare

bleare mennes eies , & to stoppe their
eares in thaforenamed wytours, that
men should nother heare nor see, what
those autors both wryte and teache so
playnlye , that except men shoulde be
made bothe starke blynde and deafe,
they can not but of necessitie , yf they
will reade, and weye them indifferet=ly,
bothe heare and see , what they doo
meane, whan eloquence, craste, and sy=
nesse of wytte haue done all that they
can. Nowe let vs heare the olde wyp=tours
of the Breke churche.

Origene.

Eccl. Hist.
Li. 6, ca. 3

Origen, which lyued about. 1250.
yeares ago: a man for the excellencie
of his learning so hyghly esteemed in
Christes churche, that he was copted &
judged ynglyster teacher in his tyme
of Christes religio, the cofounder of her=
esies, the scholemaister of many god=ly
makers , & an opener of the hyghe
mysteries in scripture. He wryting vp
on the .15. chap. of S. Mattheus gos=
pel, sayeth thus: But yf any thing entre
into the mouthe, it goeth away into the
bely, & is auoided into the draught. Yea
& that meate which is sanctified by the
worde of God & prayer, concerning the
mater therof, it goeth away into the be=lye, & is auoyded into the draught . But
for ynglyster which is added vnto it, for y

proportion of the faithe, it is made profitable, making the mynde hable to perceave and see that which is profitable. For it is not the material substance of bread, but the worde which is spoken vpon it, that is profitable to þ man that eateth it not unworthely. And this 3 meane of the typical & symbolical (that is, sacramental) bodye. Thus farre go the wordes of Origene, where it is playne, furst that Origene speaking here of the sacrament of the Lordes supper, as the last wordes do plainly signifie, dothe meane & teache, that the material substance therof is receaved, digested, & auoyded, as the material substance of other bread & meates is, which rould not be, if ther were no material substance of bread at all, as the fantastical opinion of transubstantiation dothe pur. It is a worlde to see þ answer of þ papistes to this place of Origene. In þ disputacions whiche were in this mater in the Parliament house, and in bothe the uniuersities of Cambridge and Oxforde, they that defended transubstantiation sayd, that this parte of Origene was but set furth of late by Erasmus, and therfore is to be suspected. But howe bayne this their

The pa
pistes ob
jection a
gainst
Origene.

D 2 answer

answer is, it appeareth playnly. For so may al the good olde autors, which laye in olde libraries, & are set furthe of late, be by this reason rejected, as Clemes Alexandrinus, Theodoretus, Iustinus, Ecclesiastica historia Nicephori, & other such. An other answer they hadde, sayeng that Origine is noted to haue erred in som pointes, and therfore faiche is not to be genen in this mater vnto hym. But this answer well weighed dothe ministre good mater to þ cleare confutacion of it self. For in dede we graunt, that in som poyntes Origene did erre. But those errours are gathered out and noted both of S. Jerome, and Epiphanius, so that his workes (those errours excepted) are now so muche the more of autoritie, þ such great learned men toke paynes to drawe out of hym, what so ever they thought in him to be written amysse. But as concerning this mater of the Lordes supper, neither they nor yet euer any other auncient autor did ene saye, that Origene did erre.

Nolwe because these two answers haue ben of late so confuted and confounded, that it is wel perceaued, that they will take no place; therfore some which

Gard. to
the: 166,

whch haue written sence that tyme,
haue forged twoo other answerres,
even of the same molde. The former
wherof is, that O^rigen^e in this place
spake not of the sacrament of bread or
wyne of the Lordes table, but of an o= b
ther mystical meate: of the which S.
Augustine maketh mencion to be ge= b
uen unto them, that were taught the
faulthe, before they were baptised. But
O^rigenes owne wordes in .ij. senten= b
ces before rehearsed, being put toge= b
ther, proue this answer vntreue. For
he sayeth, that he meaneth of that fi= b
gurative and mystical body, which p= b
fiteth them, that doo receaue it worthi= b
ly, alluding so playnlye unto S. Pau= b
les wordes spoken of the Lordes sup= b
per: that it is a shame for any learned
man to open his mouthe to the
contrary. And that breade whch S.
Augustine speaketh of, he can not proue
that any such thing was vsed in O^rigenes tyme. yea & though that couldc
be proued, yet was ther never bread
in any tyme called a sacramental bo= b
dy, sauing the sacramental bread of
the Lordes table, which is called of O^r
igen^e the typical and symbolical bo= b
dye of Christ.

D;

The

Gard. in
the same
place.

The seconde of the two newe fōūde
answeres, is yet most monstrous of al
other, which is this. But let vs graūc
(saye they) that Origen spake of þ Loꝝ
des supper , and by the mater therof
was vnderstandinge the material sub-
staunce of bread & wyne: what thā, say
they: For though þ material substaunce
was once gone , & departed by reason
of Transubstanciacion, whiles the for-
mes of the bread and the wyne did re-
mayne, yet now it is no inconueniece
to saye, that as the material substaunce
did departe at the entring in of Chri-
stes body vnder thāfore sayd seruices:
so whan the sayd formes be destroyed
and do not remayne, than cometh a-
gayn the substaunce of bread & wyne.
And this say they, is very mete in this
mysterie, that that which beganne w̄
the miracle, shall ende in a myracle .

þf I hadde not redde this fantasie , I
wolde scarcely haue beleued, that any
learned mā euer wolde haue set furth
suche a foolish fantasie : Which noe
onlye lacketh all grounde , either of
Goddess worde, reason, or of any aun-
cient wrytour, but is also cleane con-
trarie to the common rules of schole
diuinicie:which is, that no miracle is.

to be affirmed and put without necessitie. And althoughe for their former miracle, which is their Transubstantiacio, they haue some colour, thoughe it be but bayne , sayeng , it is done by the power and vertue of these wordes of Christ, This is my bodye: yet to make this seconde miracle of returning the materiall substance agayne, they haue no colour at all. O: elles I pray them shewe me , by what wordes of Christ is y seconde myracle wrought. Thus ye maye see , that the sleightes and shiftes whiche crafte and witte can inuenire to wraaste the true sense of Origene, can not take place. But nowe let vs heare one other place of Origene, and so we wyll let him go.

Origene in the ii. Homilie *Super Leuiticum*, sayeth, that ther is also euen in the fourre Gospelles, and not onlye in the olde Testament, a lettrec (meaning a literall sense) whiche tylleth . for ys shou folowe (sayeth he) y lettrec in that sayeng : Except ye eate the fleshe of the sonne of man, & drinke his blodd. &c. This lettrec dothe tell . yf in that place the lettrec dothe kil, wherin is comayded the eating of Christes fleshe : than surelye in those wordes of Christe,

D 4 wher

wherin Christ comaundeth vs to eate
his body, the literal sense therof like-
wise dothe kill. Soz it is no lesse crime
but even the same and all one in the
literal sense, to eate Christes bodye, &
to eate Christes fleshe. Wherfore if the
one doo kil, except it be vnderstanden
figuratively and spiritually: than the
other surely dothe kill likewise. But
that to eate Christes fleshe dothe kil so
vnderstanden, Origene affirmeth
playnly in his wordes aboue rehear-
sed: Wherfore it can not be iustly de-
nyed, but to eate Christes body literal-
ly vnderstanden, must nedes (after
hym) kill likewise.

The answer that is made to this
place of Origene of the papistes, is so
folishe, that it bewrayeth it self, with-
out any further confutation. It is the
same, that they make to a place of S.
Augustine, in his boke *De doctrina Chris-
tiana*: Wher as Saint Augustine spea-
keth in effecte þ same thing that Ori-
gene dothe here. The papistes answer
is this: To þ carnal man þ literal sense
is hurtful, but not so to the spiritual.
As though to vnderstande that in his
proper sense, which ought to be taken
figuratively, were to the carnall man
a dayne

a daungerous perile : but to the spiritu-
tual man non at all.

Now to Chrysostome, whom I ~~Chrysostom~~
bring for the seconde wrytour in the
greke churche. He speaking agaynst
þ vñholi vsing of manes body, whiche
after S. Paule ought to be kept pure
and holy, as the very temple of the holy
goost, sayeth thus: If it be a fault (say-
eth he) to translate the holyed vesselles,
in the which is conteyned not the true
body of Christ, but the mysterie of the
body, to private vses: how muche more
offence is it to abuse and defile the ves-
selles of our body?

These be the wordes of Chrysos-
tome. But I trowe that here many
fowle shiftes are devised , to deafeate
this place. The autor (sayeth one) is
suspected. I answer. But in this place
never fault was foudne with hym, vñ-
to these our dayes. And whether this
autor was Iohñ Chrysostome him self
the Archebishop of Constantinopole,
or no: that is not the mater. For of all
it is graunted, that he was a wrytour
of that age, and a man of great lear-
nyng: so that it is manifest, that this
whiche he wryteth, was the receaved
opiniō of learned men in his dayes .

D 5 D

In opere
imperfecto.
ho. ii. in
Memb.

Or elles vndoubtedly in suche a
mater, his sayeng shoulde haue bene in
Gardis. to pugned of som ywrote in his tyme,
the 198. or nere vnto the same. Maye (sayeth
chicction, an other) if this solucion will not serue,
we maye saye, that Chrysostome did
not speake of the vesselles of the Lordes
cuppe, or such as were than vsed
at the Lordes table, but of the vesselles
vsed in the temple in the olde lawe.
This answer will serue no more than
the other. For here Chrysostome spea-
keth of suche vesselles, wherin was y
which was called the body of Christ,
although it was not y true body (say-
eth he) of Christ, but the mystery of
Christes bodye. Now of the vessels of
the olde lawe, the wrytours doo use no
suche maner of phrase: for their sacri-
fices were not called Christes body.
For than Christ was not but in Sha-
dowes and figures, and not by the Sa-
crament of his body revealed. Eras-
mus which was a man that coulde un-
derstande the wordes and sense of the
wrytour, although he wolde not be
seen to speake agaynste this errore of
transubstanciacien, because he durst
not: yet in his tyme declareth playnely
that this sayeng of this wrytour is

non

non otherwise to be vnderstanden.

yet can I (sayeth the thirde papist) Gard.ii
fynde out a fyne & subtil solucion for the same
this place, & graunt all that yet is say- place
ed, bothe allowing here the wrytour, &
also that he ment of the vesselis of the
Lordes table. For (sayeth he) the body
of Christ is not conceyned in them, at
the Lordes table, as in a place, but as
in a mysterie . Is not this a prety
myste, and a mystical solucion? But by
the same solucion than, Christes body
is not in the Lordes table, nor in the
priestes handes, nor in the pire, and
so is he here no where. For they will
not saye, that he is either here or ther,
as in a place. This answer pleasech so
well the maker, that he hym self (af-
ter he had played with it a litel while,
and shewed the fynesse of his wytte &
eloquence therin) is content to geue it
ouer & say: but it is not to be thought,
that Chrysostome wolde speake after
this fynesse or subteltie: and therfore
he returneth agayn unto the seconde
answer for his shooce Auctor, whiche
is sufficiētly confuted before. An other
shoote place of Chrysostome I will re-
hearse, which (if any indifferēcy maye
be

be hearde)in playne termes setteth
furth the truch of this mater. Before þ
bread (saith Chisostome Ad Cesariū Mo-
nachū) be halowed, we cal it bread, but þ
grace of God sanctifieng it by the mea-
nes of the priest, it is delivered now frō
the name of bread, and estemeth worthy
to be called Christes body, although the
nature of bread tarye in it still. These
be Chisostomes wozdes : wherin I
praye you , what can be sayed or
thought more playne against this er-
G ad. 10
the 20. ob rour of transubstanciacion, than to de-
clare, that the bread abydeth so still:
And yet to this so playn a place , som
are not ashamed thus shamefully to
elude it, sayeng: we graunt, þ nature
of bread remayneth still thus, for that
it maye be sene , felt , and tasted : and
yet the corporal substance of þ bread
therfore is gone , least two bodies
should be confusid together, & Christe
should be thought impaneate.

What contrarietie and falshead is
in this answer, the symple man maie
easily perceave. Is not this a playne
contrarietie, to graunt that the natur
of bread remayneth so still, þ it maye
be sene , felt, and tasted: & yet to saye,
the corporal substance is gone, to ac-
uoide

worde absurdite of Christes impanacion: And what manifest falshead is this, to saye or meane, that if the bread shold remayne still, than must folowe the inconuenience of impanacion? As though the very bread could not be a sacrament of Christes body (as water is of baptisme) except Christ shold vnyte the nature of bread to his nature, in vnicie of persone, and make of the bread, God.

Now let vs heare Theodoretes, which is the last of the thre Breke au-
tors. He wryteth in his dialoge Contra Eutichen thus. He that calleth his natu-
ral body, corne, and bread: and also na-
med hym self a vyne tree: even he the
same hathe honoured the Symboles
(that is the sacramental signes) with
the names of his body and blood, not
chaungeing in dede the nature it self,
but adding grace vnto the nature.

What can be more playnly sayed,
than this, that this olde wrytour say-
eth: that although the Sacramentes
beare the name of the body and blood
of Christ, yet is not their nature chan-
ged, but abydeth stil. And wher is tha-
the papistes transubstantiation?

The same wrytour in þ secunde dia-
logue

Dial. 1.

be hearde)In playne termes setteth
furth the truthe of this mater. Before þ
bread (saith Chrysostome Ad Cesariū Mo-
nachū) be halowed, we cal it bread, but þ
grace of God sanctifieng it by the mea-
nes of the priest, it is deliuered now fro
the name of bread, and estemeth worthy
to be called Christes body, although the
nature of bread tarye in it still . These
be Chrysostomes wordes : wherin I

G ad. 10 praye you , what can be sayed or
thought more playne against this er-
the 201. ob rour of transubstantiaciō, than to de-
clare, that the bread abydeth so still:
And yet to this so playn a place , som
are not ashamed thus shamefully to
elude it, sayeng: we graunt, þ nature
of bread remayneth still thus, for that
it maye be sene , felt , and tasted : and
yet the corporal substaunce of þ bread
therfore is gone , least two bodies
should be confused together, & Christe
should be thought impaneate.

What contrarietie and fallethead is
in this answer, the symple man maie
easily perceave. Is not this a playne
contrarietie, to graunt that the natur
of bread remayneth so still, þ it maye
be sene , felt, and tasted: & yet to saye,
the corporal substaunce is gone, to a-
voide

wosde absurdicie of Christes impanacion? And what manifest falshead is this, to saye or meane, that if the bread shold remayne still, than must folowe the inconuenience of impanacion? As though the very bread could not be a sacrament of Christes body (as water is of baptisme) except Christ shold bnyte the nature of bread to his nature, in bnytie of persone, and make of the bread, God.

Now let vs heare Theodoretesus, which is the last of the thre Breke au- Theodoretesus
tors. He wryteth in his dialoge Contra Eutichen thus. He that calleth his natural body, corne, and bread: and also named hym selfe vyne tree: even he the same bathe honoured the Symboles (that is the sacramental signes) with the names of his body and blood, not chaungeing in dede the nature it self, but adding grace vnto the nature.

What can be more playnly sayed, than this, that this olde wryptour sayeth: that although the Sacramentes beare the name of the body and blood of Christ, yet is not their nature chaunged, but abydeth stil. And wher is tha the papistes transubstantiacion?

The same wryptour in þ secõde dia-
logue

Dial. 2

toge of þ same worke against þaſore
ſaid heretike Eutiches, wryteth yet
more playnly agaynst this error of
transubſtantacion, if any thing can
be ſaycd to be more playne. For he
makeſt the heretike to ſpeake thus
againſt hym that defendeth the true
doctrine, whom he calleth Orthodoxus.

As the sacramentes of the body
and blood of our Lorde are one thing
before the invocation, and after the invocaſion they be changed, and are made
an other: ſo likewife the Lordes body
(ſaythe the heretike) is after the aſſump-
cion or ascencion in to heauen, turned
in to the ſubſtance of God: the heretike
meaning therby, that Christ after his
aſſencion, remayneth no moze a man.
To this Orthodoxus anſwereth thus,
ſayeth to þ heretike; Thow art taken
(ſayeth he) in thyne owne ſnare. For
those myſtical ſymboles or ſacramētes
after the ſanctificacion doo not goo out
of their owne nature, but they tarye and
abyde ſtill in their ſubſtaunce, figure
and ſhape, yea & are ſenſibly ſene & gro-
ped to be þ same they were before .cc.

At these wordes the papilles doo
ſtartle: and to ſaye the truthe, these
wordes be ſo playne, ſo ful, & ſo cleare
that

that they can not tell, what so saye,
but yet they will not ceasse to goo a-
bout to playe the cattles, and to cast
their colouris ouer them, that the cru-
the, which is so plainly told, should not
haue place. This autor wrote (saye
they) before the determination of the
churche. As who wold saye, what so
ever that wicked man *Innocentius*, the
Pope of Rome determined in his con-
gregacions with his monkes and
friers, that must be (for so *Dun*: sayeth)
holdeyn for an article and of the sub-
staunce of our faithe. Some do charge
this autor that he was suspected to be
a Nestorian, which thing in Calcedon
rounswall was tried and proued to be
false. But the fowlest shifte of all, and
yet the best that they can finde in this
mater, whan none other will serue:
is to saye, that *Theodorete* understandeth
by the worde (substaunce) accide-
tes and not substaunce in dede. This
glose is like a glose of a lawer vpon a
decree, þ terv wherof beginneth thus:
Statuimus, that is, We decree. The
glosse of the lawer ther (after many
other pretty shiftes ther set furthe)
which he thinketh will not well
serue to his purpose, and therfore at
the

D. More
man in the
conuocacio
n house.

the last to cleare the mater, he sayeth thus after þy mynde of one lawer.

Difflac.ca Vel Dic(sayeth he) Statuimus, id est, abrogamus, p̄t is: or expoude we do decree, that mus, is, we abrogate or disanull. Is not this a goodly and worthy glose: who will not say, but he is worthy in the lawe, to be reseyned of counsail, that can glose so wel, and synde in a mater of difficultie, such syne shiftes? And yet this is the lawe, or at leass the glose of the lawe. And therfore who can tell, what perile a man maye incurre to speake against it, except he were a lawer in dede, which can kepe him self out of the briers, what wynde so euer blowe?

Hitherto ye haue hearde three wytours of the Breke churche, not all what they doo saye: for that were a labour to great for to gather, and to tedious for þy reader: But one or two places of euery one, the which how playne, how ful, and how cleare they be against the errore of transubstancion, I referre it to the iudgemente of the indifferent reader. And now I will likewise rehearste the sayenges of other three olde auncient wytours of the latine church, & so make an ende.

And

And furst I will begynne wth
Tertullian, whom Cipriane the holy Tertullian
martyr so highly esteemed, that whan
so euer he wolde haue his boke, he
was wont to saye: Geue vs now the
Master. This olde wrytour in his 4.
boke agaynst Marcion the heretike, sa-
eth thus: Jesus made þ breade, which
he toke, and distributed to his disciples
his body, sayeng: This is my body.
That is to saye (sayeth Tertullian) a
figure of my body. In this place it is
playne, that after Tertullianes expo-
sition, Christ ment not by calling the
bread his body, & the wyne his blood,
that either the bread was the natu-
rall body, or the wyne his natural
blood, but he called the his body and
blood, because he wolde institute the
to be vnto vs sacramentes: that is,
holy tokenes and signes of his body
and of his blood: that by them reme-
bring and firinely beleuing the bene-
fites procured to vs by his body
which was torne & crucified for vs,
and of his blood which was shed ~~for~~
for vs vpō the crosse: and so with tha-
kes receauing these holy sacraments,
according to Christes institution,
might by the same be spiritually nou-

E

rished

ryved and ledde to the entreasle of all godlynelle in vs here in our pilgri-
mage & iournaye, wherin we walke,
vnto euerlasting lyfe. This was un-
doubtedly Christ our sauours mide,
and this is Tertullianes exposition.

Gard. to
she. 16. ob-
jection.

The wranglyng that the Papistes
doo make to elude this sayeng of Ter-
tullian, is so farre out of frame, that
it euен wearieþ me to thinke on it.
Tertullian wryteth here (saye they)
as none hathe done hitherto before
him. This sayeng is toto manysell
false: for Origene, Hilarie, Ambrose,
Basil, Gregorie Nazianzene, saint
Augustine, and other olde autors, lyke
wyse doo call the sacrament, a figure
of Christes bodye. And where they
saye, that Tertullian wrote this,
whan he was in a heate of dispuſa-
tion, with an heretike, conetyng by
all meanes to ouerthroure his aduer-
ſarie. As who saye, he wolde not take
hede, what he dyd saye, and specially
what he wolde wryte in so hyghe a
mater, so that he might haue the bet-
ter hande of his aduersarie. Is this
credible to be true in any godlye wry-
ſman? How muche leſſe thā is it wor-

shy

thy to be thought or credited in a man
of so great a wytte , learning and ex-
cellencye , as Tertullian is worthilye
esteemed ever for to haue ben :

Lykewyse this autor in his furst
boke agaynst the same heretike Ma-
tion , wryteth thus : God did not reiece
bread , which is his creature : for by it he
hath made a representaciō of his body .
Now I praye you , what is this to
saye , that Christ hathe made a repre-
sentacion (by bread) of his body , but
that Christ hadde instituted and ordain-
ned bread to be a sacrament , for to re-
present unto vs his body : Now whea-
ther the representacion of one thing
by an other , requireth the corporal
presence of the thing which is so rep-
resented or no , every man that hath
understanding , is hable in this point
(the mater is so cleare of it self) to be
a sufficient iudge .

The seconde doctour and wrytlour
of the latine churche (whose sayenges
I promysed to set furthe) is S. Au-
gustine : of whose learning and esti-
macion I nede not to speake . For
all the churche of Christ bothe bathes

Augustin

Ez and

and ever hathe hadde hym for a man
of most singular learnyng, witte, and
diligence, bothe in setting farrthe the
true doctrine of Chристes religion, &
also in the defence of the same against
heretikes. This autor as he hathe wri-
ten most pleyntuously in other wa-
ters of our faiche, so likewise in this
argument he hathe written at large
in many of his workes, so playnly as
against this errorre of transustanciac-
on, y the papistes loue least to heare of
hym, of al other wrytours: partly for
his autoritie, & partly because he ope-
neth the mater more fully, than any
other doth. Therfore I will rehearse
no places of him, thā heretofore I haue
done of the other. And furst, what can
be more playne, than that which he
wryteth vpon the 89. psalme, speakeing
of the sacrament of the Lordes body
and blode: and rehearsing (as it were)
Chристes wordes to his disciples, after
this maner. It is not this body, which
ye doo see, that ye shall eate, nother shall
ye drynke this blode, which the souldys-
ours, y crucifie me, shall spill or sheade.
I doo commende vnto you a mysterie,
or a sacramēt, whiche spiritually vnder-
stanted shall geue you life.

Now

Now if Christ had no moo natural and corporal bodies, but that one which they thā presently bothe hearde & sawe , nor other natural blood, but that which was in the same body, and the which the souldiours did afterwarde cruelly shede vpon the crosse: and nother this body nor this blood was (by this declaracion of S. Augustine) either to be eaten or dronken , but the mysterie therof spiritually to be vnderstandinge: than I conclude (if this sayeng and expositio[n] of S. Augustine be true) that þ mysterie which the disciples shoulde eate, was not the natural body of Christ, but a mysterie of the same spiritually to be vnderstandinged. For as S. Augustine sayeth in his 20. boke Contra Faustum. ca. 21. Christes fleshe and blood was in the olde testament promySED by similitudes and signes of their sacrifices, and was exhibited in dede and in truthe vpon þ crosse, but the same is celebrated by a sacrament of remembraunce vpō þ aultare. And in his boke De fide ad Peñum, ca. 19. he sayeth, that in these sacrifices , mea-nyng of the olde lawe, it is figuratively signified, what was than to be geuen: but in this sacrifice it is evidently signi-

E:3 fied

fied, what is already geuen (understanding in the sacrifice vpon the autare) the remembraunce and thankes geuing for the fleshe, which he offred for vs: & for the blood which he shedde for vs vpon the crosse: as in the same place and evidently ther it maye appeare.

An other evident and cleare place, wherin it appeareth, that by the sacramentall bread, which Christ called his body, he ment a figure of his bo-
dy. As vpon the. 3. Psalme, wher S.
Augustine speaketh this in playne
termes. Christ did admittie Judas
vnto the feast, in the which he commis-
ded vnto his disciples the figure of
his boodye. This was Christes last
supper before his passion, wherin he
did ordayne the sacrament of his bo-
dy, as all learned men doo agree.

S. Augustine also in his, 23. epistle
to Bonifacius teacheth, how sacramen-
tes doo beare the names of h[oly] thinges
wherof they be sacramentes, bothe in
Baptisme, and in the Lordes table,
even as we call euery good frydaye,
the daye of Christes passio: and euery
Easter daye, the daye of Christes re-
surrection: whan in very dede ther
was but one daye wherin he suffered,
and but one daye wherin he rose. And

Why doo we than call them so, which
are not so in dede, but bicausē they are
in like tyme and course of the yeare,
as those dayes were, wherin thosē
thinges wer done? Was Christ sayeth
(S. Augusti) offred any more but once?
And he offred him self. And yet in a sa-
crament or rep:escētaciō not only euery
solēne feast of Easter, but also euery
day, to þ people he is offred: so þ he do-
the not lye, þ sayeth: He is euery daye
offred. For if Sacramētes hadde not sō
similitudes or likenesse of those thinges,
wherof they be Sacramētes, they could
in no wise be sacramētes: & for their si-
militudes and likenesse commonly they
haue the names of the thinges, wherof
they be sacramētes. Therfore as after
a certayn maner of speche, þ sacramēt of
Christes body is Christes body, the sa-
crament of Christes blood is Christes
blood, so likewise the Sacrament of
faith is faith.

After this maner of speche (as S.
Augustine teacheth in his questiones
Super Leuiticum, & Cōtra Adamantinū) it is
sayed in scripture, ihat. vii eares of
corne be seuen yeares: seuen fyen be vii.
yeares, & þ rocke was Christ: & blood is
þ soule: the whiche last sayeng (sayeth

L 4 Sainte

Question.
57.

Cap. 13.

Contra
Maximis
num. li. ca.
22.

S. Augustine in his boke *Contra Adversarios* (sayeth he, speaking of the sacramentum) is vnderstandinged to be spoken in a signe or figure. for the Lord himself did not sticke to saye, This is my body, whan he gaue the signe of his body. for we must not considre in sacramentes (sayeth S. Augustine in an other place) What they be, but what they doo signifie: for they be signes of thinges, being one thing in them selues, and yet signifieng an other thing. for the heauenly bread (sayeth he, speaking of the sacramental bread) by some manner of speache is called Christes body, whan in very dede it is the Sacrament of his body. &c.

What can be more playne, or more clearly spoken, than are these places of S. Augustine before rehearsed, if men were not obstinately bent to mayntene an vntruthe, & to receave nothing what so euer dothe set it furthe: yet one place more of S. Augustine will I allege, which is very cleare to this purpose, that Christes natural body is in heauen, and not here corporally in the Sacrament, and so let him departe. In his. 50. treatise, whch he wryteth vpon John, he teacheth playnly and clearly, how Christ being

being bothe God and man, is bothe
here after a certayn maner, and yet in
heauen and not here in his natural
body and substance, which he toke
of the blessed virgin Mary: speaking
thus of Christ and sayeng. By his di-
uine Maiestie, by his prouidence, and
by his unspeakeable & iuyisble grace,
þ is fulfilled whiche he spake: Beholde
I am with you vnto the ende of the
worlde. But as concernyng his fleshe
whiche he toke in his incarnation, as
touching that whiche was borne of the
virgine, as concernyng that whiche was
apprehended by the Jewes & crucified
vpon a tree, and taken downe from the
crosse, lapped in lynen clothes, and bu-
ryed, and rose agayn, and appeared
after his resurrection, as concernyng
that fleshe, he sayed: ye shall not euer
haue me with you. Why so: for as co-
cernyng his fleshe, he was conuersant
with his disciples .xl. Dayes, and they
accompanyeng, seing, and not folowm^g
hym, he w^t vp in to heauen, & is not
here. By þ presēce of his diuine maies-
tie he did not departe: as concernyng þ
presēce of his diuine maiestie, we haue
Christ euer w^t vs: but as concernyng þ
presence of his fleshe, he sayed truly to

• E 5 his

his disciples: Ye shall not euer hane me
with you. for as concernyng the presence
of his fleshe, the churche hadde hym but
a fewe dayes: now it holdeith hym by
faithe, though it see hym not.

Thus muche S. Augustine speaketh
repeating one thing so often: and al to
declare and teache, how we shold un-
derstande the maner of Christes be-
ing here with vs: which is by his gra-
ce, by his prouidence, & by his diuin
nature: and how he is absent by his
natural body whiche was borne of the
virgin Mary, died, and roose for vs, &
is ascended up to heauen, and ther sit-
teth (as is in the articles of our faithe)
on the right hande of God, & thence (&
from non other place sayeth S. Augu-
stine) he shall com on the later daye, to
adge þ quykke & the dead. At þ whiche
daye the righteous shall chan lise vp
their heades, and the light of Goddes
truthe shall so shyne, that falshead
and errors shalbe put in to perpetu-
al confusion: righteousnesse shal haue
the upperhande, and truthe that daye
shal beare awaie þ vicerie, al thenes-
mies therof quyte ouerthowne, to
be troden vnder foote for euer more.
O Lorde, Lorde, I beseeche the hasten
this

this daye, than shal shew be glorified
with the glorie due vnto thy holy
name, and vnto thy divine maiestie:
and we shal syng vnto thee, in al ioye,
and felicitie, laude and praise for euer
more. Amen.

Here now wold I make an ende.
For me thinkes, S . Augustine is in
this mater so full and playne , and of
that autorite, that it shoulde not nede
after this his declaracion, being so fir-
mely grounded vpon Goddes worde,
and so well agreing with the other
ancient autors, to bring in for the co-
firimation of this mater any moe:
and yet I sayed, I wolde allege three
of the latin churche , to testifie the
truthe in this cause. Now therfore v-
lacke of all shalbe Gelasius , which was a
bishop of Rome, but one that was bi-
shop of that sea, before þ wicked usur-
pacion and tyrannye therof spredde &
burst out abrode in to all the worlde.
For this man was before Bonifacius,
yea and Gregorie the furst : in whose
dapes bothe corruption of doctrine
and tirannical usurpacion did chiefly
growe, and hadde the upperhande.

Gelasius in an epistle of the twoo na-
tures of Christ, Contra Eunichem, writech
thus

Gelasius

thus: The sacramentes of the body and blood of Christ, which we receave are godly thinges, wherby and by the same we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet neverthelesse the substance or nature of the bread & wyne dothe not departe nor go awaye.

Note these wordes I beseche you, and considre, whether any thing can be more playnly spoken, than these wordes be agaynst the errore of trā- substanciacion, which is the grounde and bitter roote, wherupon spring all the horrible errors before rehearsed.

Wherfore seeing that þ falshead dothe appeare so manifestly, and by so many wayes so playnly, so clearlye and so fully, that no man nedeth to be deceaued, but he that will not see, or will not understande: Let vs all that doo loue the truthe, embrace it, & forsake the falsehead. For he that loseth the truthe, is of God: and the lacke of the loue therof is the cause why God suffereth men to fall in to errors, and to perishe therin: yea and as S. Paul sayeth, why he sedeth unto them illusions, þ they beleue lies, unto their owne condemnation: because (sayeth he)

he)they loued not the truthe . This
truthe no doubt is Goddes worde.
For Christ hym selfe sayeth vnto his
father: Thy worde is truthe. The 10.17.
loue and light wher of almighty
the God our heauenly father
geue vs , & lyghten it in
our heartes by his ho
ly spirite, through
Jesus Christ our
Lord. Amen.

Vincit Veritas.